

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is being submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 29, 2004. This Amendment is being submitted within the time period for response, extending to August 29, 2004, with a two-month extension of time.

Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 13, and 15 are currently amended.

Claims 18 and 20-21 are cancelled in the present Amendment.

Claims 1-17 remain pending following entry of the present Amendment.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-18 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. ("Axberg") (U.S. Pat. No. 6,009,466) in view of Ofer et al. ("Ofer") (U.S. Pat. No. 5,890,204). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 1 and 3, as amended, the Office has asserted that Axberg teaches an enterprise network including server computer systems and client computer systems, wherein the server computer systems include a server component and the client computer systems include a client component. The Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion by the Office.

More specifically, Axberg teaches that only one host computer in the entire network that is connected to the storage network will function as the storage network manager. For example, Axberg (column 5, lines 38-42) states the following:

"In the preferred embodiment, one of the host computer systems functions as a storage network manager, while the other systems function as agents of the network manager."

Therefore, Axberg's teachings regarding the storage management program residing only on one host computer is in opposition to the present invention, as recited in claims 1 and 3, in

which a plurality of computer systems include client computer systems (plural) each having the client component.

Furthermore, the Office has inferred that the storage management program as taught by Axberg is analogous to the client component as recited in claims 1 and 3. However, the client component, as recited in amended claims 1 and 3, is required to provide a graphical user interface that is defined to enable a user to physically build and modify the RAID array of disks. In contrast, Axberg teaches that the storage management program is used for storage network planning purposes as opposed to physically building and modifying a RAID array of disks. For example, Axberg (column 7, lines 14-24) states the following:

"The configuration planning function of the storage network management program will typically be performed before a storage network is constructed, i.e., physically connected together."

"The host system 110 may be an isolated system, not connected to any network, or it may be connected to an information processing network via medium 115 as shown in Fig. 1, but without a storage network yet connected."

In accordance with the foregoing, the Applicants submit the Axberg's teachings regarding the limitation of one storage network manager (host system), having the only instance of the storage network management program for planning of the storage network, are diametrically opposed to the present invention as embodied in each of claims 1 and 3. Additionally, both Axberg and Ofer are silent with respect to the server component residing on the server computer systems, as required by claims 1 and 3.


The Office has asserted that Ofer teaches the graphical user interface provided by the client component at the client computer system, as required by claims 1 and 3. However, the graphical user interface of the present invention is required to enable a user to physically build and modify the RAID array of disks of the storage enclosure connected

to the server computer system from the client computer system without requiring the user to locally interact with the server computer system. The Applicant submits that neither Ofer, Axberg, nor the combination thereof teach the aforementioned feature of claims 1 and 3.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that the combination of Ofer and Axberg fail to teach each and every feature of claims 1 and 3, as amended, as required to establish a case of prima facie obviousness. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the rejections of claims 1 and 3. Also, since each of claims 2 and 4-17 ultimately depend from one of claims 1 and 3, the Applicants submit that each of claims 2 and 4-17 are patentable for at least the reasons provided above for claims 1 and 3. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the rejections of claims 2 and 4-17.

Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6900 ext. 6914. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ADAPP091A). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP



Kenneth D. Wright  
Reg. No. 53,795

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085  
Telephone: (408) 749-6900  
**Customer Number 25,920**